

Apr-26-06 10:37A mp williams

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

8606491385

P.01

APR 26 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

David G. Converse et al

Serial No.: 10/717,089

Filed: November 19, 2003

Title: Electric Storage Augmentation of Fuel
Cell System Transient Response

Docket No.: C-2593

Art Unit: 1745

Examiner: Gregg Cantelmo

OK TO ENTER

J. Converse

5/4/09

GREGG CANTELMO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile
transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark
Office (Fax No. 571-273-8300) on April 26, 2006.

Barbara Cicero

Barbara Cicero

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

1. This paper is responsive to the Final Rejection dated March 31, 2006. Only claim 8 remains for consideration.

2-4. Claim 6 is rejected as not enabled by the specification. However, page 8, line 28 through page 9, line 1 refers to an example: "such as...the voltage on the side of the converter next to the supercapacitor bank...." In other words, in this method of claim 6, the controller and the regenerative DC/DC converter can drive the storage device beyond whatever ratio there may normally be between the main output voltage of the system and the nominal voltage of the storage device.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the -112 rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

5. Claim 6 is rejected as obvious over Jung in view of Koenig. These two references adequately disclose lines 1-9 of claim 6, which establishes some sort of ratio or multiple between the main system voltage and that of the storage device. However, they don't include any reference to the method of claim 6, set forth in lines 9-12, which forces the voltage to be higher or lower than whatever the ratio voltage might be. Thus, the invention of claim 6 not only controls the